theory and Kohler's *Gestalt* theory, and, finding them inadequate, passes on to a chapter on organismic theories which the reader approaches with keen expectation' unless he has already discovered that the author is demanding the impossible. Like the famous chapter on *Snakes in Ireland,* this chapter is brief, and for the same reason. But perhaps to say that is going a little too far. Three € explanatory theories ' of organization are briefly stated as organismic theories.

First, that of J. Shaxel, who postulates a ' formative element * which is specifically organic, f an immanent organismic developmental principle, which is expressed in the concept of " persistence of form "'. My only comment is that principles, like laws, are, in my view, mental products of mental activities and cannot be legitimately projected into physico-chemical processes to mould them to the heart's desire.

Secondly, the syntony theory of Heidenhaim. ' Syntony is a natural force, developing from the specific organization of living matter.' But we remember that the prime and essential task of a ' system theory' is to explain organization; whereas this theory postulates the organization as given and then ascribes to it the quite peculiar forces, whether formative or syntonic, required to explain all the phenomena in question. Hence, when we are told that Heidenhaim demands * the rejection of the view of development which regards it as a sum of separate processes, and its replacement by one which sets the whole of the organic germ with its in-dwelling " syntony " in

the forefront', I cannot feel that this is the system-theory
which Bertalanffy demands.

The same objection lies against the third explanatory
system-theory, the field theory of Gurwitsch, devised